



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/635,252	08/06/2003	Thomas B. Zingale	G08.026/U	9453
54205 7590 06/05/2009 CHADBOURNE & PARKE LLP 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA NEW YORK, NY 10112				
EXAMINER				
AUGUSTINE, NICHOLAS				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2179				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/05/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/635,252

Applicant(s)

ZINGALE ET AL.

Examiner

NICHOLAS AUGUSTINE

Art Unit

2179

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 March 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 13, 15-22 and 24-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 13, 15-22 and 24-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

- A. This action is in response to the following communications: Request for Continued Examination filed 3/30/2009.
- B. Claims 13, 15-22, 24-37 remain pending.
-

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 3/30/2009 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions

covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 13, 15-22, 24-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barros, Barbara (US 6307573), herein referred to as Barros in view of Williams, Simon Guy (US 6,735,593 B1), herein referred to as "Williams" and further in view of Applicant's own admitted prior art of corporate entities.

Note: The term "corporate entity" as disclosed in the specification is merely directed towards an entity which is a selectable element presented in a graphical user interface. For purposes of this rejection the term "corporate" is non-functional descriptive material in that any entity will suffice for purposes of showing the disclosed function in the cited prior art.

As for independent claim 13, Barros teaches a method comprising: presenting a plurality of selectable entities (col.16, lines 20-23) and a plurality of selectable elements wherein a first one of the plurality of entities is at least partial owner of a second one of the plurality of entities and is graphically presented as being organizationally upstream or organizationally downstream from the second one of the plurality of entities wherein a third one of the plurality of entities is at least partial owned by a forth one of

the plurality of entities an is graphically presented as being organizationally downstream from the forth one of the plurality of entities (col. 17, lines 1-8; wherein a hierarchical owned list such that illustrated in figure 6c and 7abc the node "World Maps" owns "N.America" and "N.America" owns "United States of America" and "United States of America" owns "Hawaii" which forms an owned parent to child relationship mapped (World Maps-> N.America-> United States of America-> Hawaii; These four nodes are entities within the hierarchy list of entities illustrated and explained in figures 6c and 7abc. Further in col.19, lines 40-61 and figures 8a-h, it is shown as another example of how Barros explains a plurality of entities that shows at least partial owner of other entities (parent to child relationship) that is presented "upstream" and "downstream" wherein the user is able to see parents of nodes and children of nodes as well as being able to navigate forward and backwards); receiving a selection of the one the second corporate entity (col.18, line 33); receiving a selection of one of the plurality of selectable elements (col.18, line 40); determining information corresponding to the one selected element with and relating to the selected second corporate entity and presenting the determined information to a user (col.18, line 41).

Barros does not specifically disclose that the entities are termed corporate entities and that the corporate entities, wherein each of the plurality of corporate entities is owned by one or more shareholders of the corporate entity. However in the same field of endeavor Williams teaches corporate entities, wherein each of the plurality of corporate entities is owned by one or more shareholders of the corporate entity (col.21, line 11; wherein entities can be corporate entities among other things) and (col.12, lines 50-63;

wherein entities are corporate entities "Enterprise" and shareholders of the entities are associated). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Williams into Barros; this is true because Williams teaches a system for a user to interact with a plurality of entities, and a plurality of relationships, each relationship defining a nexus between at least two entities (col.2, lines 34-56). Williams solves the problem of providing a system that allows the user to interact with and navigate among a plurality of entities and their relationships to display contextual information utilizing a graphical user interface.

Further it is well known in the art that a plurality of corporate entities is owned by one or more shareholders of the corporate entities and as admitted prior art by the Applicant (page 1, lines 9-16 of immediate application). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Applicants admitted prior art into Barros as modified by Williams, this is true because Applicant teaches of corporate entities and navigation among a plurality of them which is similar to the navigation and graphical user interface that is taught by Barros as modified by Williams. Further The term "corporate entity" as disclosed in the specification is merely directed towards an entity which is a selectable element presented in a graphical user interface. For purposes of this rejection the term "corporate" is non-functional descriptive material in that any entity will suffice for purposes of showing the disclosed function in the cited prior art.

As for dependent claim 15, Barros teaches a method according to Claim 13, wherein the determined information comprises one or more of: information relating to a

formation of the second corporate entity; a location of corporate documents relating to the second corporate entity; contact information relating to the second corporate entity; ownership information relating to the second corporate entity; information relating to regulators of the second corporate entity; information relating to officers of the second corporate entity; information relating to jurisdictions in which the second corporate entity is qualified to do business; information relating to reports filed or to be filed on behalf of the second corporate entity; controllers information relating to the second corporate entity; and funds information relating to the second corporate entity (fig.6c and 7de, wherein the user can select more than one category during execution of system).

As for dependent claim 16, Barros teaches a method according to Claim 13, further comprising: receiving instructions to generate a document including document information relating to the selected second corporate entity; determining the document information; generating the document; and presenting the document to the user (fig.7de).

As for dependent claim 17, Barros teaches a method according to Claim 13, further comprising: receiving instructions to edit the determined information; determining whether the user is authorized to edit the determined information; and

Art Unit: 2179

editing the determined information if it is determined that the user is authorized to edit the determined information (col.4, line 24).

As for dependent claim 18, Barros teaches a method according to Claim 17, further comprising: associating information identifying the user with the edited information (col.4, lines 18-24).

As for dependent claim 19, Barros teaches a method according to Claim 17, further comprising: presenting an indication that the determined information is in the process of being edited (col.9, lines 25-45).

As for dependent claim 20, Barros teaches a method according to Claim 13, further comprising: associating information identifying a date on which the information was edited with the edited information (col.25-45).

As for dependent claim 21, Barros teaches a method according to Claim 13, further comprising: receiving a request for an image of a document relating to the selected second corporate entity; and presenting the image to the user (col.9, lines 10-19).

As for independent claims 22 and 31, Barros teaches a computer-readable medium storing processor-executable process steps and corresponding apparatus to manage corporate entities, the process steps and apparatus comprising: a step to present a plurality of selectable corporate entities and a plurality of selectable elements, wherein a first one of the plurality of corporate entities is at least partial owner of a second one of the plurality of entities and is graphically presented as being organizationally upstream or organizationally downstream from the second one of the plurality of entities wherein a third one of the plurality of entities is at least partial owned by a forth one of the plurality of entities an is graphically presented as being organizationally downstream from the forth one of the plurality of entities (*col. 17, lines 1-8; wherein a hierarchical owned list such that illustrated in figure 6c and 7abc the node "World Maps" owns "N.America" and "N.America" owns "United States of America" and "United States of America" owns "Hawaii" which forms an owned parent to child relationship mapped (World Maps-> N.America-> United States of America-> Hawaii*; These four nodes are entities within the hierarchy list of entities illustrated and explained in figures 6c and 7abc. *Further in col. 19, lines 40-61 and figures 8a-h, it is shown as another example of how Barros explains a plurality of entities that shows at least partial owner of other entities (parent to child relationship) that is presented "upstream" and "downstream" wherein the user is able to see parents of nodes and children of nodes as well as being able to navigate forward and backwards*); and an a step to receive a selection of the second corporate entity; a step to receive a selection of one of the plurality of selectable elements; a step to determine information corresponding to the one selected element and relating to the

selected second associated corporate entity and a step to present the determined information to a user (note the analysis of claim 1 above).

Barros does not specifically disclose that the entities are termed corporate entities and that the corporate entities, wherein each of the plurality of corporate entities is owned by one or more shareholders of the corporate entity. However in the same field of endeavor Williams teaches corporate entities, wherein each of the plurality of corporate entities is owned by one or more shareholders of the corporate entity (col.21, line 11; wherein entities can be corporate entities among other things) and (col.12, lines 50-63; wherein entities are corporate entities "Enterprise" and shareholders of the entities are associated). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Williams into Barros; this is true because Williams teaches a system for a user to interact with a plurality of entities, and a plurality of relationships, each relationship defining a nexus between at least two entities (col.2, lines 34-56). Thus Williams solves the problem of a system that allows the user to interact with and navigate among a plurality of entities and their relationships to display contextual information utilizing a graphical user interface.

It is well known in the art that a plurality of corporate entities is owned by one or more shareholders of the corporate entities and as admitted prior art by the Applicant (page 1, lines 9-16 of immediate application). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Applicants admitted prior art into Barros as modified by Williams, this is true because Applicant teaches of corporate entities and navigation among a plurality of them which is similar to the navigation and

graphical user interface that is taught by Barros as modified by Williams. Further The term "corporate entity" as disclosed in the specification is merely directed towards an entity which is a selectable element presented in a graphical user interface. For purposes of this rejection the term "corporate" is non-functional descriptive material in that any entity will suffice for purposes of showing the disclosed function in the cited prior art.

As for dependent claims 24 and 32, Barros teaches a computer-readable medium according to Claim 22, wherein the determined information comprises one or more of: information relating to a formation of the second corporate entity; a location of corporate documents relating to the second corporate entity; contact information relating to the second corporate entity; ownership information relating to the second corporate entity; information relating to regulators of the second corporate entity; information relating to officers of the second corporate entity; information relating to jurisdictions in which the second corporate entity is qualified to do business; information relating to reports filed or to be filed on behalf of the second corporate entity; controllers information relating to the second corporate entity; and funds information relating to the second corporate entity (note the analysis of claim 1 above, it is noted that the user can select more than one category for viewing information pertaining to the currently selected category, fig.6c and 7de). Barros does not specifically disclose that the entities are termed corporate entities and that the corporate entities, wherein each of the plurality of corporate entities is

owned by one or more shareholders of the corporate entity. However in the same field of endeavor Williams teaches corporate entities, wherein each of the plurality of corporate entities is owned by one or more shareholders of the corporate entity (col.21, line 11; wherein entities can be corporate entities among other things) and (col.12, lines 50-63; wherein entities are corporate entities "Enterprise" and shareholders of the entities are associated). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Williams into Barros; this is true because Williams teaches a system for a user to interact with a plurality of entities, and a plurality of relationships, each relationship defining a nexus between at least two entities (col.2, lines 34-56). Thus both Williams and Barros teach systems that allow the user to interact with and navigate among a plurality of entities and their relationships to display contextual information utilizing a graphical user interface. It is well known in the art that a plurality of corporate entities is owned by one or more shareholders of the corporate entities and as admitted prior art by the Applicant (page 1, lines 9-16 of immediate application). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Applicants admitted prior art into Barros as modified by Williams, this is true because Applicant teaches of corporate entities and navigation among a plurality of them which is similar to the navigation and graphical user interface that is taught by Barros as modified by Williams.

As for dependent claims 25 and 33, Barros teaches a computer-readable medium according to Claim 22, the process steps further comprising: a step to receive

instructions to generate a document including document information relating to the second corporate entity; a step to determine the document information; a step to generate the document; and a step to present the document to the user (fig.5a-b).

As for dependent claims 26 and 34, Barros teaches a computer-readable medium according to Claim 22, the process steps further comprising: a step to receive instructions to edit the determined information; a step to determine whether the user is authorized to edit the determined information; and a step to edit the determined information if it is determined that the user is authorized to edit the determined information (col.9, lines 10-45).

As for dependent claims 27 and 35, Barros teaches a computer-readable medium according to Claim 26, the process steps further comprising: a step to associate information identifying the user with the edited information (col.9, lines 1-45).

As for dependent claims 28 and 36, Barros teaches a computer-readable medium according to Claim 26, the process steps further comprising: a step to present an

indication that the determined information is in the process of being edited (col.9, lines 10-18).

As for dependent claims 29, Barros teaches a computer-readable medium according to Claim 22, the process steps further comprising: a step to associate information identifying a date on which the information was edited with the edited information (col.4, lines 18-25 and col.9, lines 10-45).

As for dependent claims 30 and 37, Barros teaches a computer-readable medium according to Claim 22, the process steps further comprising:

a step to receive a request for an image of a document relating to the corporate entity; and a step to present the image to the user (col.9, lines 10-18).

(Note :) It is noted that any citation to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. In re Heck, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33, 216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting In re Lemelson, 397 F.2d 1006, 1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968)).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 03/30/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

After careful review of the amended claims (given the broadest interpretation) and the remarks provided by the Applicant along with the cited reference(s) the Examiner does not agree with the Applicant for at least the reasons provided below:

A1. Applicant argues that Barros does not teach *"wherein a first one of the plurality of entities is at least partial owner of a second one of the plurality of entities and is graphically presented as being organizationally upstream or organizationally downstream from the second one of the plurality of entities wherein a third one of the plurality of entities is at least partial owned by a forth one of the plurality of entities an is graphically presented as being organizationally downstream from the forth one of the plurality of entities"*; more specifically the Applicant states that "Barros is nothing more than a world map with the Examiner's superimposed notation of various countries and states applied to the world map".

R1. Examiner does not agree, Barros as shown before in figures 7A-H and column 17 line 30 through column 19 line 40 that what is shown is a hierarchy of interconnected pieces of information wherein the user is able to start at a root position (e.g. world map) from which is able to navigate to linked sets of information (e.g. Hawaii map) through the graphical user interface and to be shown the route of navigation (list of selected nodes as shown in figure 7e; N.Amer. -> State-> Hawaii) the user has chosen wherein the user is able to go back and forth through the set of hierarchical information. With at least this understanding of the prior art it should become clear that Barros teaches the claimed language.

To further prosecution the Examiner will now point to another cited section of Barros separate from the interconnected maps as argued above that also teaches the claimed subject matter as MPEP 2123 and 2144 should be considered were Barros teaches *wherein a first one of the plurality of entities is at least partial owner of a second one of the plurality of entities and is graphically presented as being organizationally upstream or organizationally downstream from the second one of the plurality of entities wherein a third one of the plurality of entities is at least partial owned by a forth one of the plurality of entities an is graphically presented as being organizationally downstream from the forth one of the plurality of entities* (col.19, lines 40-61 and figures 8a-h). Barros explains a plurality of entities that shows at least partial owner of other entities (parent to child relationship) that is presented "upstream" and "downstream" wherein the user is able to see parents of nodes and children of nodes as well as being able to navigate forward and backwards.

For at least these two points presented, the interconnected linked maps and the hierarchically managed list of entities which is displayed adjacent to the interconnected linked maps, it is evident that Barros teaches the claimed subject matter "*wherein a first one of the plurality of entities is at least partial owner of a second one of the plurality of entities and is graphically presented as being organizationally upstream or organizationally downstream from the second one of the plurality of entities wherein a third one of the plurality of entities is at least partial owned by a forth one of the plurality of entities an is graphically presented as being organizationally downstream from the forth one of the plurality of entities*".

Barros shows a hierarchical owned list such that illustrated in figure 6c and 7abc the node "World Maps" owns "N.America" and "N.America" owns "United States of America" and "United States of America" owns "Hawaii" which forms an owned parent to child relationship mapped (World Maps-> N.America-> United States of America-> Hawaii). These four nodes are entities within the hierarchy list of entities illustrated and explained in figures 6c and 7abc.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Note the cited references: Rivette et al. (US Pat. 6,499,026); Zingale et al. (US Pub. 2004/0066409) and Quine, Douglas (US Pat. 6,782,415)

Inquires

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas Augustine whose telephone number is 571-270-1056 and fax is 571-270-2056. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday: 9:30am- 5:00pm Eastern.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on 571-272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Steven B Theriault/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2179

/Nicholas Augustine/
Examiner
Art Unit 2179
May 26, 2009